



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## BRIEF MENTION.

Mr. JOHN B. BURY's elaborate edition of the *Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London and New York, Macmillan & Co.) might well challenge an elaborate criticism, but, so far as my examination has gone, the book seems to me chiefly remarkable for the studious chase after recurrent words and the studious ignoring of the fact that the editor's analyses of the Pindaric odes have been largely anticipated—principle and all. See Luigi Cerrato, *La tecnica composizione delle odi pindariche*, Genova, 1888,—bon résumé des théories antérieures et conclusions judicieuses—says Croiset (*Histoire de la littérature grecque*, II 413, note). To be sure, Mr. Bury may not have seen Cerrato's book, but he must have had access to Cerrato's sources, and these the Italian scholar has freely and handsomely acknowledged. But for aught that appears in Mr. Bury's pretentious introduction, the principle of *enjambement*, of 'overlapping,' is a discovery of his own. Not a word of Croiset, whom it would be a shame for an editor of Pindar not to have read; not a word of those who, coming after Croiset, have extended and fortified Croiset's positions. But in bringing against Mr. Bury this charge of an undue neglect of his predecessors I hesitate, for Mr. Bury is undoubtedly a man of great originality. This he showed as early as 1881, when he accomplished the marvellous feat of 'contaminating' *εἰρόμην* with *εἶπον* (see Mahaffy and Bury's *Hippolytus*, v. 291); and there are indications in his very pretty Theocritean rendering of Rossetti's 'Sister Helen' (Dublin Translations, ed. by Tyrrell, 1882), that he was restrained from similar liberties by the mosaic character of his work. The ordinary schoolmaster will stand amazed and ask with Herakles in the *Frogs* τίς ὁ νοῦς; τί κόθορνος καὶ ῥόπαλον ξυνηλθέτην; but I hasten to assure him that in certain ranges of scholarship bad grammar and dainty rhetoric often go hand in hand.

---

'Dainty rhetoric' reminds me of a Saturday Reviewer, whose identity is clearly revealed by his comment on *Ol. 6, 15*. See *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, Michaelmas 1885. Himself an admirable writer, and so far a competent judge, he objected to my Pindar on the ground that it was 'not a Pindaric book,' and to the style on the ground that it was a 'bad style.' Ever since the date of this criticism, now nearly six years old, I have examined with some curiosity the books which this distinguished scholar has put forth, in the hope of finding out how one must modify one's style in order to be a sympathetic commentator of Horace, of Aischylos, of Euripides, but I have not been able to differentiate the graceful fluency of one work from the fluent grace of another, and I have failed to see that my monitor was Horatian here, Aeschylean there, Euripidean elsewhere. But I do see that Mr. Bury has taken the lesson to heart, and anything more Pindaric—after Mr. Bury's standard of the Pindaric—than his introductions to the several odes it is hard

to imagine. To be sure, the Pindaric style is what may be called in the slang of the day a *fin de siècle* Pindaric style. It belongs to that school of English prose in which one expects to find 'lush' and 'parbreak' and similar frippery. *Digitos habet*. It has toying fingers, not transfixing talons, and gives no notion of Pindar's masculinity. Perhaps it would be well for those who, in my judgment, have yet to learn their Pindar, to consider the bold words of Wilamowitz, who has studied Pindar to some purpose: 'Der stolze Aegide schrickt nicht vor dem hässlichen zurück (Herakles II 183).' But if Mr. Bury's Pindar is a *fin de siècle* Pindar, no such charge can be brought against the edition of KLEANTHES, a Greek scholar of Hermupolis, whose commentary, published in 1886-7, reached me only a few months ago. It is true that I made no superhuman efforts to procure it, as I had suspended my Pindaric studies, and as the reports I had seen did not lead me to expect a new revelation. The preface waives all claim to erudition, and well it might. The latest commentator cited is Dissen, and the metres follow the scholia. The strength of the book is supposed to lie in the development of the unity of the Pindaric odes, and under the treatment of Kleanthes all the digressions are to be brought into harmony with the main idea—*πάντα δὲ, he says, ἄ τῶς παρεκβολαὶ ἐνομίζοντο, ἐπειρασάμην, ὥς δυνάμειος εἶχον πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἰδεῶν μου ἐκθεσαν, νὰ ἀποδείξω τῇ ἀρχικῇ ὑποθέσει ἐκάστου τῶν ἐπινίκων στενότατα συνηνωμένα*. That has been the aim of all the great commentators of Pindar, from Schmid down, and Kleanthes is not solitary in his aims nor in his failures. In making a summary of an ode the commentator is almost forced to bring about some kind of connection, which may deceive the writer but will not deceive the reader.

---

In a fascinating and suggestive study (*Die Apologie der Heilkunst*, Vienna, 1890), GOMPERZ has claimed for Protagoras the authorship of a remarkable discourse (*περὶ τέχνης*) contained in the Hippocratean corpus. Of course on this theory the discourse is the discourse of a layman, and the plea for the healing art just such a plea as a sophist would make for any other art, but it is not without interest that in a fragment of the *Κόλακες* of Eupolis (147 K), Protagoras appears as a medical adviser. To be sure, the advice does not seem to us strictly professional, but really it is almost as professional as the advice of Eryximachos in Plato's *Symposium* (185 D):

*πίνειν γὰρ αὐτὸν Πρωταγόρας ἐκέλευν, ἵνα  
πρὸ τοῦ κυνὸς τὸν πνεύμον' ἐκκλυστον φορῇ.*

Needless to say, *τοῦ κυνός* means Sirius, a fact that has escaped the latest historian of Greek comedy, Denis, who translates (I, p. 195) : 'Protagoras recommande Callias à boire afin d'avoir le poulmon plus humide que celui d'un chien.'

But whether Protagoras is the author of *περὶ τέχνης* or not, he is not the author of the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, as several of my correspondents have been kind enough to point out. For 'Protagoras,' therefore, XI 390, l. 18, read 'Pythagoras,' and for another example of this very common error of the types see X 502.